

such a premium reduction. Within these provisions in an important legislative compromise that provides for the orderly redemption of Financial Assistance Corporation stock held by FCS institutions.

Mr. Speaker, this is sound legislation the House should adopt today and send back to the other body for consideration. I urge its immediate passage.

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2029 because it will provide mechanisms for ensuring affordable credit in rural America. Our farmers and ranchers have been and will continue to experience in the next several years, great uncertainty with roller coaster market prices and impending changes in Federal agricultural policy. It will be more important than ever that there be reliable credit sources available to them.

Passage into law of regulatory relief for the Farm Credit System will hopefully provide for a reduction in operating costs that can be passed on to System borrowers. The legislative changes that are being proposed to Farmer Mac will provide both commercial banks and Farm Credit System institutions with the means to lower the cost of borrowing money as well.

Previous reforms of Farmer Mac have not been as successful as we had hoped, which is why additional authority is currently needed. Lending is inherently risky, however, I am hopeful that these reforms will allow Farmer Mac to become a viable entity and to develop a secondary market for long-term agricultural real estate loans. It is as balanced an approach as could be achieved.

Again, I support this legislation and look forward to prompt action by the other body.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2130, the Farmer Mac reform bill.

Farmer Mac was established to provide a reliable source of long-term agricultural loans. Its goal was greater competition in loan rates for farmers and ranchers. Unfortunately, Farmer Mac's enabling legislation was too restrictive and a secondary market for agriculture never fully developed.

H.R. 2130 seeks to address these impediments. I believe the reforms contained in H.R. 2130 would allow Farmer Mac to prove the viability of the agricultural secondary market. My constituents are encouraged by the opportunity that a reformed Farmer Mac could bring to rural borrowers.

I'm encouraged that the House is acting on Farmer Mac today. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2130.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand this legislation, it is necessary. If we do not pass it, many in this House on both sides of the aisle will have many constituents who will be hurt. America, in my opinion, will be hurt if we do not allow this to pass at this time.

However, we have a selective sense of responsibility. We did not want to hurt veterans, we did not want to hurt those who go to national parks, we did not want to hurt those who got Social Security checks, and I did not want to hurt any of those, either. So what we continue to do is ask people to come to work, as a responsible employee, but guess what, we are not going to pay you, and we lock out others who cannot serve their constituencies. People are at risk because apparently some Members of this House are not feeling it.

The leadership is about to suggest that this House, like Pontius Pilate, wring its hands and say that we will go home until January 23; no responsibility for the pain that is being caused, no responsibility for the services that are being denied; like Pontius Pilate, it must be somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I will not object to this particular piece of legislation, because unlike some in this House, I believe we ought to be responsible. People sent us here to ensure that their lives would be, to the extent we could affect them, be better. To object to this would not affect that end, but some in this body believe that if their end is appropriate, any means they utilize to attain it are justified. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 153) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as passed, and that a motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I would first ask the gentleman to explain the motion before the House, before I ask a couple of questions about it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution that affects only the District of Columbia and only their ability to spend local funds. It is a continuation of the bill that was passed last year that provided continuing funding for the District's own local funds through January 3. This is identical to the legislation we passed at the end of the last session but this would continue that funding authority until January 25.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman, then, is it correct to say this allows only the use of District funds?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. OBEY. And that even if this passes, the District will not have received any Federal payment since, I believe, December 15?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct. The District has received about \$370 million of the \$660 million Federal formula funds and approximately \$8 million of the \$52 million that go toward the pension fund.

Mr. OBEY. Continuing my reservation of objection, let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I am troubled by this, because while I think we want the District government to remain open, that there would be no need for this specific resolution, as narrowly drawn as it is tonight, if the House leadership would simply allow us to bring up the Dole resolution which passed the Senate yesterday, which opens up all of the agencies of Government.

We have the ridiculous situation under which some Federal workers have been paid for work which they were not allowed to do, and other Federal workers are being required to perform work for which they are not getting paid. The District is not the only jurisdiction with problems. There are 10 States, I am told, that are about to run out of needed funds to administer unemployment compensation programs. There are 95 percent of workplace safety inspections which are not taking place. There are 2,500 mortgage applications a day under SBA that are not being attended to. Veterans' education benefits are in question for 170,000 veterans. Pension fraud cases are not being pursued. The Older Americans Act and Meals on Wheels are being put at risk, all because of the arrogance, it seems to me, of some Members of this body who put their political and economic ideology ahead of the right of taxpayers to receive the services for which they have already paid.

Therefore, I am extremely troubled by the narrow nature of this proposition, but I would simply suggest that I do not see any useful purpose that would be served for anyone on this side of the aisle to engage in the same kind of childish leverage games that we have seen go on on the part of the leadership of this House and the Speaker, so I very reluctantly will not object.

However, I would ask, in the process of not objecting, I would ask when the House Republican leadership would allow us to bring to the floor for a vote the resolution sent over by the Senate, sponsored by Mr. DOLE yesterday, which would open up the entire Government.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, surely my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, understands that this is a very unique situation. It does not involve any Federal funds, unlike the other continuing resolution that he is discussing, and these are not frivolous matters. These are important and very serious and monumental, in fact, discussions about the direction of the Federal Government. It obviously has taken some time.

I am sure that when there is some agreement on the future direction of this country and its budget, that we will bring that forward.

Mr. OBEY. Continuing my reservation of objection, let me say that I recognize that the decision on that question is above the gentleman's pay grade and above mine, but I would nonetheless simply take this occasion to inform the Chair and the House that in the event that there is no objection made to this request, that after this is disposed of, I would ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk H.R. 1643, the Dole proposition, in order to permit immediate consideration in the House, because that would reopen all of Government and it would pay everybody for work that they are doing, which might seem a quaint idea, given the Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere that this House has taken on, but nonetheless, I think would meet with considerable support on the part of the American taxpayer.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the District of Columbia several questions.

The appropriations bill for the District of Columbia was to be submitted to the President for signature by October 1 so that the ordinary operations of the D.C. Government could continue. Can the gentleman from New York tell me when that appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 was submitted to the President?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this bill obviously has not been concluded; its work is still in conference. There are substantial differences between the Senate position and the House posi-

tion. I spoke with Senator JEFFORDS as recently as today to try to get some resolution.

As the gentleman knows, this has been a very difficult year for the District of Columbia. We passed legislation that basically overhauled the Home Rule to provide for a control board, a financial control board. We never received a budget from the District until 2½ months after it was supposed to be submitted.

We received a number of budgets. We received the City Council budget, a mayoral budget, a control board budget, all of which, as the gentleman knows since he serves on the subcommittee, slowed us down substantially.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would respond to the following question: Would it be necessary to pass any temporary spending bill if the subcommittee, which we both serve on, had done its job and submitted an appropriations bill to the President on time?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think the subcommittee did yeoman work, and it definitely did do its job. Unfortunately, there are substantial differences between the Senate and the House positions. I think the House did its job; I think the conference has work to do yet.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if I might, the fact is that we are over 3 months into this fiscal year. This subcommittee has failed to produce an appropriations bill for the District of Columbia. We are forced to lurch from spending bill to spending bill with gross uncertainty among the residents of the District of Columbia about their future. To blame anyone other than this committee and this Congress for this dereliction of duty would be improper.

I would like to ask the gentleman another question: The District of Columbia appropriations bill which came over from the Senate carried with it an amendment offered by Senator BOXER, Senator DOLE, and Senator DASCHLE entitled No Budget, No Pay. It said that so long as the Federal Government was shut down, Members of Congress would not receive their paychecks. That provision was included in the bill, the Senate version of this appropriations bill, and I am asking the gentleman from New York whether it is included in his temporary spending bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. First of all, let me just clarify, I do not really think the gentleman meant to say that we are derelict in our duty. I think we have worked very, very hard, all of us, both parties, both Houses, to try to get these issues resolved and they are substantive issues.

As far as the issue of pay, I heard the chairman of the Senate subcommittee and the chairman of the conference say that it was his feeling that it would not be the Senate's position in a final conference agreement.

It is not a part of the House's position. Many Members thought it was punitive and it treated the Members of Congress differently than all other Federal workers.

Mr. DURBIN. So if I understand the gentleman's remarks, he does not want to be punitive to the Members of Congress during this budget crisis? Is that his position?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is correct. I have no intention to be punitive to anyone, any member of the Federal Government.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman fielding any phone calls in his district about this Government shutdown?

For instance, in my district, Federal prison guards received 1 week's pay for the month of December. They are going to work every day and putting their lives on the line in prisons, guarding dangerous prisoners, and they are being paid for 1 week out of 4 in December.

Does the gentleman consider that punitive to Federal prison guards who are doing their job?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure the gentleman is aware, we passed those appropriations bills. The President, as a matter of fact, signed the appropriations bill that allowed the prisoners to get paid and vetoed the appropriations bill that paid for the guards. So that is a question of priorities, and I do not quite understand it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman continue to reserve the right to object?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the right to object.

It is also true that if the Dole resolution were passed by this body today, that prison guard and others would be full-time back at work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to point out that despite all of the rhetoric that we have heard on this floor today, there are three appropriations bills which have still not even made it to the President, the first being the District of Columbia bill which we are discussing right now; the second being the Foreign Operations bill which is hung up because of differences between Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House on the issue of family planning and abortion; and third, the Labor, Health,

Education and Social Services appropriations bill, a huge share of the Federal Government.

All of those programs at this point are in limbo because we still have not had resolutions worked out between the House and the Senate. So it seems to me that there is a high degree of congressional culpability for the fact that this Government is not operating under regular appropriations bills; and it also seems to me that it comes with considerable ill grace to blame the President for the fact that he has not even been able to consider whether to veto bills, because three of them have not gotten to him yet.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve my right to object, I think it is clear that one of the reasons this temporary spending bill is being brought to the floor is to avoid any debate over no budget, no pay, to make sure that this House does not go on record on the proposition as to whether or not Members of Congress will continue to take recesses and vacations, will continue to receive paychecks while this group of Republicans decides that 280,000 Federal employees will be furloughed and hundreds of thousands of innocent people will be penalized by the strategy. That is part of the strategy behind this temporary spending bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I would just remind my colleague that the reason that those employees are not at work is because the President vetoed those appropriations bills—

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman—

Mr. WALSH. And we just had an opportunity to override that veto, and we did not get it done.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Illinois controls the time under his reservation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia demands the regular order. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Can I continue my reservation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has demanded the regular order. The gentleman will have to choose the regular order. The gentleman will have to choose whether or not to object at this time.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will withdraw his regular order request, I promise to conclude my remarks momentarily.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my right to object.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to

my friend and fellow committee member, we have all worked very hard on this committee to try to get the District of Columbia back to work and get the appropriations bill passed and so forth. Unfortunately, it is one of the bills that is getting caught in this massive debate over the size and scope of Government over the next 7 years.

I think, as the gentleman knows well and certainly the ranking Committee on Appropriations member knows well, that the chairman has worked very hard on that process and will continue to do so. What we are trying to do now is at the request of the District of Columbia folks to let them continue to work.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York one final question: Why are we passing this temporary spending bill for the District of Columbia?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the delegate from the District of Columbia has asked us to try to get the people back to work. This is their money, it is not ours, and that is the reason. It is a very narrow CR that affects only their money, no Federal money.

Mr. DURBIN. I would just say to the gentleman from New York, I hope he will remember those words when the next D.C. appropriations bill comes up, because the gentleman has taken a position in the past that this Congress has some responsibility even over the local funds of the District of Columbia, and now he is saying that we should let them have their own money with no strings attached. I think that may not be consistent with the gentleman's overall position.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman's dialog. I think the gentleman has made an important connection here between the point of suspending the pay of the Members while we are suspending the pay of other people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has renewed his request for regular order. Does the gentleman from Illinois object?

Mr. DURBIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR AND WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privilege report (Rept. No. 104-445) on the resolution (H. Res. 330) authorizing the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair from January 5, 1996, through January 23, 1996; waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rules XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules during that period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present for a number of rollcall votes at the end of last session. I was paired for several of the votes, but on other votes I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 871, "no." Rollcall 872, "no." Rollcall 873, "yes." Rollcall 874, "yes." Rollcall 875, "no." Rollcall 878, "no." Rollcall 879, "no." Rollcall 880, "no." Rollcall 881, "no." Rollcall 883, "no." Rollcall 884, "no."

#### EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria in order to permit the immediate consideration in the House of the Senate amendment to the House amendment that is the Dole appropriation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

#### SUSPENDING PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2658), a bill which would suspend pay of Members of Congress during this Government shutdown and thereby force us to play by the same rules as the rest of the Federal Government, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by